

Appn. No.: 09/748,995  
Amdt. Dated June 11, 2004  
Reply to Office Action dated April 20, 2004

**REMARKS**

**I. Status of the Claims:**

Claims 5, 7 and 8 are pending in the application. In the Office Action dated April 20, 2004, claims 5, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement and also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,119,051 to Anderson, Jr., et al. ("Anderson"). In this amendment claim 6 has been cancelled. Claim 5 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 6 and amended for clarification.

**II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

In the Office Action dated April 20, 2004, claims 5, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement because of a perceived inconsistency in using the term "incompatible" for compounds meant to operate together. To cure this perceived inconsistency, claim 5 has been amended to replace the word "incompatible" with "different proprietary" thereby retaining the claimed capabilities for reconciling different systems, without the potentially confusing term "incompatible".

Appn. No.: 09/748,995  
Amdt. Dated June 11, 2004  
Reply to Office Action dated April 20, 2004

### III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,119,051 to Anderson, Jr., et al. ("Anderson").

The Examiner has relied of Official Notice of "transmitting of data from one computer to another in order to perform different functions at a remote computer or a workstation." Applicant continues to traverse this Official Notice for the reasons provided in the prior response.

Additionally, applicant submits that amended claim 5 includes method steps and functions that are not described in Anderson, either at a mainframe, or at a remote location. In particular, the following steps previously recited in claim 6 are not disclosed or suggested by Anderson.

interpolating the printstream in the work station computer to generate one or more Mail Run Data Files (MRDF) in an appropriate format for each of the different proprietary control systems and containing piece level data for the mail pieces that are to be assembled in the plurality of inserter systems; and

providing the one or more Mail Run Data Files to the plurality of inserter systems interpolating the Mail Run Data Files for operation of each inserter system interpolating the Mail Run Data Files;

In particular Anderson does not include steps for providing an "appropriate format for each of the different proprietary control systems".

Accordingly, irrespective of the merits of the asserted Office Notice, amended claim 5 includes steps not disclosed or suggested by the asserted reference. As such, it is requested that the §103 rejections of claim 5, and independent claims 7 and 8, be withdrawn.

Appn. No.: 09/748,995  
Amtd. Dated June 11, 2004  
Reply to Office Action dated April 20, 2004

#### VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the issues identified by the Examiner have been addressed and that the claims of this application are now in a condition for allowance. Favorable action on this application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Cummings  
Reg. No. 46,650  
Attorney of Record  
Telephone (203) 924-3934

PITNEY BOWES INC.  
Intellectual Property and  
Technology Law Department  
35 Waterview Drive  
P.O. Box 3000  
Shelton, CT 06484-8000